

**ECR Regional Fall General Business Meeting
The Boulevard Inn, St. Joseph, Michigan
October 5, 2012**

Call To Order 3:00—Judy Ragsdale

Introduction of new people to the Region.

Approval of March 23, 2012 Minutes: Daryl Hanson **Moved**, Amy Green **Seconded**, approved.

Accreditation-Ruth

Ruth reported that she will appoint one member of each site team to function as a “Practitioner.” She noted there is a lack of education around accreditation and what is required in CPE curriculum. She volunteered to provide a workshop at the Feb 2013 spring conference for SESs, and every other year offer a workshop for supervisors.

Ruth thanked the committee for their work. It was a very busy year.

The Committee completed 4 site reviews:

- Norton Healthcare, Louisville, KY 10 Year Review;
- Baptist Hospital East, Louisville, KY – 10 year review with one Satellite Program at Western Baptist Hospital, Paducah, KY;
- Detroit Medical Center/Vanguard CPE Center – 10 year review; and
- Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, OH – 5 year review.

Upcoming 2012 Site Reviews:

- University of Louisville Healthcare-10 year review scheduled for 10/24-25/2012.
- St. Joseph Mercy Health System, Ann Arbor, MI-Satellite Program to Accredited Member review – scheduled for 11/1-2/2012.
- Larue D. Carter Memorial Hospital, Indianapolis, IN-Candidacy to Accredited Member Review scheduled for 11/28-29/2012.
- Beaumont Health System, Royal Oak, MI – 10 year review scheduled for 12/11-12/2012.

Upcoming 2013 Accreditation Schedule:

- Summa Akron City and St. Thomas Hospitals ACPE Center, Akron, OH-Candidacy to Accredited Member + Supervisory CPE, scheduled for 01/13-15/2013.
- Nationwide Children’s Hospital, Columbus, OH-Ten Year Review scheduled for 03/6-7/2013.
- Kettering Medical Center Network, Kettering OH-Five Year Review, due 03/31/2013.
- Sisters of Charity Health System (System Center), Cleveland, OH-Five Year Review, due 03/31/2013.
- Spiritual Care and Education Center, Toledo, OH-Five Year Review, due 03/31/2013.
- Deaconess Hospital, Evansville, IN-Ten Year Review, 2013.
- OhioHealth, Columbus, OH-Ten Year Review, 2013.
- TriHealth-Good Samaritan CPE Center, Cincinnati, OH-Ten Year Review, 2013.
- Twin Towers Retirement Community, Cincinnati, OH-Ten Year Review, 2013.
- Louis Stokes Cleveland VA Medical Center, Cleveland, OH-Satellite Program to Accredited Member Review, 2013.

As approved @ Feb 22, 2013 Meeting

Two committee members have finished their term for accreditation Bob McGeeney and Vickie Johnson.

Board Report – Marla Coulter-McDonald provided a PowerPoint report that included a CPSP Update; Proposal for Academic Qualification and Equivalency Standards for ACPE Board Certification; 2013 Annual Conference; Governance Update; Board Competencies; Board Job Descriptions; - Discussion followed the Job Description presentation; Implementation of Proposed Board Structure, Classes, By-Law Changes, Consultation for RANC. Marla led the discussion regarding the - identity and Role of Board, Board Reps and the two streams of thought (corporate vs. tribal). She encouraged everyone to stay informed and follow the information on the ACPE web site. A discussion on updated changes will be provided at the spring meeting at Hueston Woods.

Appreciation was shown by our region for the work of our Board Reps.

Certification—Beth Newton Watson

National Certification—Certification of Competence of ACPE Supervisors

Issues have come up when a Candidacy certification had been removed. The commission must make specific recommendations to the Candidate when Candidacy is revoked and the Commission Chair is expected to be part of these recommendations. The commission is considering decreasing the number of commission committee members from five to three. There is also conversation about how M.Div's are different depending on the school they come from. An individual was turned down because his/her M.Div. was not from an ATS accredited school. What does an academic degree represent especially if not a Christian graduate degree? What are we looking for? Academic equivalency is continually discussed. In our region we have four Ph.D.'s who can look at equivalency. A task force has been established to look at this issue. A webinar has been created for theory writing and supervision.

Each Region did well at the Certification Commission. Four individuals from our region met the committee and two passed.

We need more readers from our region and we need to develop guidelines for outstanding papers. Materials submitted should have a group presentation (IPR, Verbatim) rather than individual supervision. If you need to meet the committee again, do not submit the same student group as the last committee.

Regional Certification—Thank you to all committee members! We are celebrating 100% at this meeting: 6 people met with a committee: 3 men and 3 women; 4 African American and 2 Euro Americans; 2 Candidates, 2 Extensions and 2 Readiness; 2 Indianapolis, 1 Pittsburgh, 1 Detroit, 1 Toledo and 1 Cincinnati.

Gary Cooper - Readiness for Supervisory Education; Mark Eberly - Readiness for Supervisory Education; Anastasia Holman - Supervisory Candidate-granted; Deborah Mansell - Candidate Extension-granted; Tony Marshall - Supervisory Candidate-granted; Versey Williams - Candidate Extension-granted.

Standards—Joe Viti

Joe led a discussion regarding three documents in preparation for the 2015 revision.

1. **Revision of Standards in Preparation for 2015:** The Standards Committee members voted to choose the large version in preparation for the 2015 revision over a small

version that would fix some minor things; and medium version that would include work on reformulating the outcomes of Level I & Level II. The large version would actually reorganize Standards and make the necessary adjustments throughout.

2. **Pastoral Review of Good Standing** – the Standards Committee is working on implementing a new Standard to deal with Supervisors who have impairment and/or incompetency issues.
3. **ACPE Peer Review, Policy, Procedure and Guidelines:** The Standards Committee is proposing a Peer Review that would be written by Standards but implemented by each of the nine regions.

[A copy of Joe's full report is included in these minutes and in was included in the November 2012 ECR Newsletter]

Professional Ethics-Yoke Lye Lim Kwong

The Role of the PEC Regional Representative:

Under the new joint process, a Regional Rep is not notified of cases in the region. The fact that Regional Reps are not notified is not about trust but about "need to know." However, the Regional Rep might have more "need to know" than the Regional Director. It would also be helpful for Regional Reps to know what is happening in the region in order to educate, rectify, etc. The Rep plays the role as a consultant to the region. It was proposed the idea of formal training in consultation skills to be offered for the Regional Representatives. 1. To offer consultation at the local level; 2. To offer educational opportunities for regional members (workshops, didactics for supervisory education students; peer reviews; etc.), and organize workshops for the Annual Conference.); 3. On the national level, to serve on investigation panels and sanction reviews as needed.

Recommended reading in understanding Ethics

Workplace Bullying- Symptoms and Solutions

Published February 16th 2012 by Routledge Mental Health– 320 pages
\$ 100.00 (Hardback)

Workplace Bullying is essential reading to learn about ethics issues that involve with investigation and discover fresh understanding to identify behaviors involved in bullying. Though there seems there is the absence of identifying racial/cultural dimensions related with bullying in this book, however, the theory of ostracism is detailed in group dynamics about organizational behaviors. Four social needs are mentioned that help readers to cultivate a healthy environment for services that promote inclusiveness in committees, organizations and CPE groups.

This book compels the readers to ask: Why do some people just watch it happening? How do you know if you are enabling the process to happen? What kinds of leaders are able to create positive ethics in organization/group environments?

Nominations – Lin Barnett

Lin presented the slate of nominees and asked for nominations from the floor. The following were elected to serve in the positions as listed:

- Daryl Hanson (R) Class 2013 for Frank Nation – Secretary
- Finance has 2 vacancies – no nominees*

As approved @ Feb 22, 2013 Meeting

- Bill Scrivener (R) Class of 2015 for Sergei Petrov – Spring Semi-Annual Conference Planning Committee
- Accreditation has 2 vacancies – no nominees*
- Certification Judy Ragsdale (R) Class of 2014 – for Laurie Hearn; Yvonne Valeris (R) Class of 2013 for Barbara Means

*Committees will work closely with Bill Foster on recruiting nominees for the spring meeting. Lin Barnett announced this was his last meeting as Nominations chair as his term ends December 31, 2012. Bill Foster will be the new Nominations Chair.

REM-Judy Ragsdale

As reported at the spring meeting, Vickie Johnson's term of office ended. Judy appointed Karen Morrow as the ECR REM Task Force Chair, effective 10/6/2012.

Regional Director – Dennis Kenny

Dennis said he is happy to report that overall our region is a healthy one. He is seeing positive movement in the region and has had conversations with several centers that are interested in CPE. Although the region is healthy there are some centers that have vacancies. There are some new supervisors and new programs are emerging. Covenant HealthCare, Saginaw MI hired Jill Rasmussen-Baker and Pine Rest Christian Mental Health Services hired Karl VanHarn. A special thanks to Bob Uken and Mark Rogers-Berry for running programs at Pine Rest during the transition. We are fortunate that we have contract supervisors that are willing to fill open vacancies for centers in transition, which doesn't seem to be the case in other regions.

Dennis encouraged all supervisors to be proactive with their administration whenever they are planning to retire so that a plan to fill the vacancy is in place as soon as possible.

ACPE Property: Dennis said that ACPE has been approached by a private developer with an interest in purchasing the ACPE Academy property. Discussions about whether to sell the property, partner with the developer to develop the entire block, sell air rights, and/or explore further interest with APC, NACC and other organizations will take place in the near future. He will have more to report at the spring meeting.

FCPE: Over the past six months FCPE took concrete steps toward improving administrative processes for recognizing contributions to FCPE and its funding initiatives on behalf of ACPE. Responsibility for FCPE's operations in Atlanta was assigned to Haas Consulting, effective October 8, 2012. Len Al Haas and Nancie Smith began working with FCPE in March and continue to provide a high quality of work. They began to focus on assessing and evaluating operations so that they could recommend improvements. Dennis encouraged members to consider FCPE when making their annual contributions.

Other: As noted during the elections, Frank Nation is stepping down as secretary – we appreciate all he has done to report our actions accurately in the minutes!

Also, this is Judy's last meeting as Regional Chair; we thank her for a job well-done!

Adjourn 4:55

Respectfully submitted,
Frank Nation

ECR Regional Meeting
St. Joseph, Michigan
October 5-6, 2012

Business Meeting
Report

Standards Committee

The Standards Committee is currently working on these three documents in preparation for the 2015 Revision.

1) Revision of Standards in preparation for 2015:

The Standards Committee chooses among these options: a small, medium, and a large version of potential changes to the standards:

The small version would fix up some minor things and add peer review, pastoral review, medical ethics, and issues we worked on already.

The medium version would include work on reformulating the outcomes of Level I and Level II.

The large version would mean to actually re-organize standards and make the necessary adjustments throughout as was suggested by some of our members.

With each version we would need to assess as a committee what kinds of resources we would need in terms of time, meetings, face to face meetings, and sub-committee work.

Comment: The Standards Committee members voted to chose the large version in preparation for the 2015 Revision.

2) Pastoral Review of Good Standing: (104.2,408,409,413)

Comment: The Standards Committee is working on implementing a new Standard to deal with Supervisors who have impairment and/or incompetency issues. The only recourse our process has in dealing with these issues is a notation, competency review, or ethics charge. All three of these are punitive and disciplinary. The Standards Committee is using four Standards (104.2, 408,409, and 413) to compose a Standard that is more pastoral, collegial, remedial, and emphasizes personal and professional development.

Rationale: ACPE members are obliged by the ACPE Code of Ethics to “take collegial and responsible action when concerns about incompetence, impairment or misconduct arise.” (104.2) The ACPE Accreditation Commission is requesting an alternative course to punitive action such as a competency review, notation, and/or an ethics charge for a supervisor when indicators arise that s/he may have impairment issues. As an organization of pastoral care educators we need an educational review process that we can invoke that is pastoral in tone and process and that emphasizes dialogue and consultation for potential impairment issues of supervisors from remedial and developmental learning are more likely to result. Some venues in which issues of concern may be identified include accreditation reviews, peer reviews, or certification committee meetings to name a few.

Purpose: The approach of this proposed policy is remedial not punitive and the purpose is to maintain a culture of professional development, continuing education, transparency, responsibility, and accountability among ACPE Supervisors.

Triggers of Good Standing: (According to Standard 413 - Continuation of Supervisory Status is contingent upon :)

- Adhering to the ACPE Code of Professional Ethics.
- Demonstrating spiritual and educational growth.
- Supervising students in an ACPE accredited program at least once every three years or participating in other CPE-related educational activities.
- Maintaining ordination or commission to function in ministry by an appropriate religious authority.
- Maintaining faith group endorsement.
- Participating in peer review at least every five years in accordance with regional procedures.
- Maintaining membership in ACPE.

Proposed Standard: When an official ACPE entity, such as accreditation site visit team or peer review committee notices a supervisor's practice may be impaired and/or a supervisor not in good standing according to Standard 413, the CPE members involved will take responsible and collegial action by calling for the formation of an Ad Hoc Pastoral Review of Good Standing Committee by the Regional Chairperson. The Committee is to consist of one member from the site-visit team (certification committee, or peer review team) that called for the review, one member from the regional accreditation committee, and one member from the regional certification committee, and two other supervisors chosen by the supervisor being reviewed.

Process of Review:

One person who notices concern talks directly with the supervisor prior to initiating further process.

The Pastoral Review of Good Standing Committee would initially form and meet with the supervisor to listen, seek understanding, convey empathy, and consider the observed concerns about impairment. (first meeting)

The supervisor may then be invited to review his/her last unit of CPE with the Committee to discuss his or her current strengths and weaknesses. The Committee members, in dialogue with the supervisor, would then make recommendations to bring about remediation and professional development, if they are determined by the committee to be necessary. (second meeting)

If a third meeting is seen by the committee to be necessary, the Supervisor and the Committee set a date to review how the supervisor in question demonstrates progress in addressing the impairment issue in a constructive, remedial manner according to the recommendations made by the Committee. The Supervisor prepares a brief written report to give structure and content to this meeting.

If the Committee is satisfied with the progress of the Supervisor in question and decides that no more meetings are needed, a report is written by the Committee and sent to the Regional Chairperson of Accreditation articulating how the supervisor in question is making progress.

If in the view of the Committee, the process is not successful in addressing needs for remedial or continuing education issues, the next step would be the review group determining if an ethics, educational, or competency review needs to be initiated.

3) ACPE Peer Review, Policy, Procedure, and Guidelines:

Comment: The Standards Committee is proposing a Peer Review that would be written by Standards, but implemented by each of the nine Regions.

Members of the Administrative Council discussed this version, and recommend that I take it back to the Standards Committee for revision because it comes across as disciplinary and not developmental. The focus needs to be supervisory friendly not adversarial. I will address our concerns with members of the Standards Committee.

Definition – The ACPE peer review process is a regular practice by which ACPE Supervisors open themselves to selected peers for consultative processing of : complaints filed against them, (if any), fulfillment of the ACPE requirements for continuing authorization to practice as supervisors, (Standard 413), and to review any accomplishments and current issues of supervisory practice, spiritual growth/struggle, peer collegiality, or faith group endorsement.

Purpose – The purpose of peer review is to maintain and continually develop the quality of one's supervisory practice and optimum human healthiness.

Supervisory Responsibility – The person being reviewed selects reviewers, arranges with them a meeting date, place and time, sends them written materials a week before, elicits leadership in a convener and a recorder, and provides initial direction for the meeting.

Frequency – Every three years for ACPE Supervisors conducting Supervisory CPE; every five years for all active supervisors.

Reviewers – At least three and not more than six reviewers conduct the review. Of those a convener and at least one other member are ACPE Supervisors. One member records the process of the review interaction.

Written Material – At least a week before the meeting, the person being reviewed supplies the reviewers with written material that is appropriate for preparing them for the meeting. Materials provided include descriptions and documentation of any formal complaints received by the supervisor and other documents that illustrate how the supervisor is maintaining the requirements of Standard 413. Suggested additional materials to assist reviewers to meet the supervisor soulfully regarding the current state of her/his life and practice and may include:

- Reflections on a particular student's progress in CPE.
- A statement of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the supervisor.
- Excerpts from evaluations written by the supervisor or the students.
- Comments on the developments or changes in the supervisor's theory, work, health, or faith group standing.
- Reflection on professional ethics principles that challenge the supervisor.
- Administrative issues that impact CPE at the supervisor's center.
- The supervisor's spiritual convictions, current state and recent development.
- ACPE peer and organizational involvements.
- Publications, awards, research, or projects of current interest to the supervisor.

Process – The meeting last at least 65 minutes; is led by the convener; and is followed by a time for immediate feedback to the person being reviewed.

Recording – The recorder, in conjunction with the reviewers, fashions a one or two page representation of the content and process of the review. A summary statement lists any recommendations or decisions by the reviewers. Appendix ZZZZ is a sample of a Peer Review Report Form.

Reporting – The convener signs the report form and sends it to the person being reviewed and to the regional official designated to oversee the regional peer review process.

Accountability – If the reviewers discern indicators of impairment, incompetence, or misconduct arising in the supervisor being reviewed (see definition in ACPE Definition of Terms Manual), they consider options for initiating ACPE procedures for addressing potentially failing ethical, competency, educational adequacy (see Standards 200) (include standard for Pastoral Review of Good Standing). Cf. ACPE Professional Ethics Standard 104.2, “take collegial and responsible action when concerns about incompetence, impairment, or misconduct arise.”

When the person designated to oversee the regional peer review process determines that a supervisor has not implemented a peer review within the required time, s/he contacts the supervisor with a reminder and a request for the date of a scheduled peer review. If a date is not received within two weeks, the regional overseer of the peer review process contacts the regional chair of certification and the regional director to arrange a review by a regional certification subcommittee. The regional chair of certification organizes a sub-committee meeting with the supervisor. The sub-committee assesses the supervisor’s readiness to continue authorization to supervise by the ACPE. A report of this meeting is sent to the chair of the ACPE Certification Commission for determination of the supervisor’s continuing as a CPE Supervisor.

Peer Review Definition – (for inclusion in the ACPE Definition of Terms document)

A peer review is a small group encounter arranged for the purpose of promoting the ongoing development of CPE Supervisors’ practice as collegial and competent.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Viti
viti@summahealth.org
330-375-3476